

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. No new subject matter has been added. Reconsideration is requested.

Specification Objections

The specification has been amended to remove the objection by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claims 7-24 have been renumbered as 6-23 as required by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 has been amended to define the acryonmns. Support for the acronyms is found on page 6, lines 12-32. The BME, RME and SE entities are also clearly shown in FIG. 3. Therefore claim 3 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hulyalkar et al. (US 5,787,080).

Claim 21 specifies receiving a reservation request frame from a transmitting device that generates a reservation request in the reservation request frame at a third network layer in an Open Systems Interconnect (OSI) model. Claim 21 also specifies transmitting the reservation request frame in accordance with an Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) 802.11 standard. Claim 21 also specifies decoding a tag from the reservation request while in the medium access control layer; reading the tag to identify a priority while in the medium access control layer; examining the priority against available resources while in the medium access control layer; and finally resolving the reservation request in terms of the examined priority while still in the medium access control layer without ever advancing the reservation request to a third network layer.

This is all clearly shown in FIGS. 2 and 3 where a wireless device 310 operates a classification entity (CE) 352 at Layer L3 that provides IEEE 802.11 tag generation 360. Page 5, lines 19-20; page 7, lines 5-11.


An access point (AP) device 210 then decodes the reservation request in the medium access control layer; reads the tag to identify a priority while in the medium access control layer; examines the priority against available resources while in the medium access control layer; and finally resolves the reservation request in terms of the examined priority while still in the medium access control layer without ever advancing the reservation request to a third network layer. Page 11, lines 3-18.

Conversely, Hulyalkar does not generate the reservation request flag at a third layer of the OSI model and then decode and resolve the reservation request flag at the MAC layer. See FIG. 3 and column 8. Further, Hulyalkar relates to reserving ATM time slots (Col. 8, line 43-col. 9, line 49) which is completely different from the IEEE 802.11 wireless transmission protocol specified in claim 21. Thus, claim 21 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Hulyalkar et al. (US 5,787,080). Claims 1-20 and 22-23 have similar limitations as specified in claim 21 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 21.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-23 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen S. Ford
Reg. No. 35,139

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613